

No other location in the nation can offer the millions and millions of visitors who will stream into the Intrepid to view and experience the shuttle.

Housing an iconic spacecraft in New York City—the media center of the world—guarantees it will appear in countless news and entertainment programs broadcast throughout the nation and world, providing incalculable public-relations value to NASA.

Just yesterday I spoke to NASA Administrator Charles Bolden and he has informed me that the Intrepid is in good shape to be the permanent hangar for one of the shuttles.

The Intrepid is competing with museums in 25 other cities to win one of the shuttles, including Washington's Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum.

NASA has been clear that they intend to award the shuttles to the sites where the most people could view them.

With the Intrepid already drawing one million visitors a year it is clear that the Intrepid is the best possible spot for a shuttle.

NASA also requires any potential host location to raise significant funds.

I have no doubt that the Intrepid's drawing power and New York City's deep and diverse philanthropic community are more than able to compile all the resources needed.

Yet skeptics may ask why a space shuttle should be brought to New York City.

Perhaps they don't know that the Intrepid led the recovery of astronauts during the Mercury and Gemini programs in the 1960s.

The exhibit will be sure to attract heavy foot traffic too: The Intrepid will house the shuttle in a glass enclosure on Pier 86—close to Times Square and many other tourist attractions, accessible from major airports, passenger-ship terminals and highways.

Countless boys and girls, as well as adults, with boundless imaginations, will be able to stroll over to the West Side and take in the truly magnificent icon of science, exploration and innovation.

With 20 institutions across the country competing to receive one of the retired shuttles, *Discovery*, *Endeavour* and *Atlantis*, we should all join the fight to bring a space shuttle to the greatest city in the world, a no-brainer.

It is a non-brainer.

I, along with some of my New York colleagues, are working hard to land the shuttle here, and I hope we are able to convince NASA that we are ready, willing—and very able—to be the home for a shuttle.

I yield the floor, and I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I object until we discuss the order of business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. COBURN. I assure my colleagues that—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHUMER. Without objection, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(Mr. SCHUMER addressed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that first the Senator from Oklahoma be recognized for 5 minutes, then the Senator from North Dakota be recognized for 10 minutes and that no motions be in order during the time of their speeches and immediately thereafter we resort back to a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, while the Senator from New York is here, I might go over 5 minutes to 6 minutes or 7 minutes. I wonder if he will object and modify his request.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that my request be modified so that the Senator from Oklahoma may have up to 10 minutes to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, I wish to spend a short period of time, and hopefully it will not even be 5 minutes.

What we have seen on the floor this afternoon is a motion to accomplish what the chairman of the Finance Committee wanted us to accomplish, without adding to the debt. We did not reach agreement on that motion. It was tabled. Then what we saw was a motion to proceed to take care of these issues by adding \$9.2 billion to the debt. That is the real debate: are we going to pay for what we do? There is not an agreement to move forward and pay for it, and there is not an agreement to move forward and not pay for it.

There is a process here called cloture, which means that by Wednesday, if all time is consumed, this problem would be solved and it would be dealt with. It is unfortunate that the potential is that we may go home and not deal with this issue, having us vote against ta-

bling a motion to supply these needed priorities but also making sure we do not add to the debt as we do it.

I look forward to the rest of the afternoon. I will not consume any additional time but will note that I do not care how we pay for it as long as it is legitimate, as long as we do not add to our kids' debt. I am hoping and willing to negotiate on any area of waste in the Federal Government that we can eliminate to pay for it. We cannot pay for part of it; we need to pay for all of it because we violate the principle of stealing from our kids.

I advise the Senator from Alabama that we have unanimous consent and I cannot break off, and the Senator from North Dakota will be recognized after I yield the floor, so I cannot in good conscience yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. I understand. I am proud of the commitment the Senator from Oklahoma has made and totally recognize it.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, this is a pretty disappointing thing to see on the floor of the Senate—a discussion about the potential of having unemployment insurance at this point in time lapse, let it lapse during one of the steepest recessions since the Great Depression.

Unemployment insurance is not some abstraction when we have 15 million, 16 million, 17 million people who got up this morning in this country and looked for work, people who lost their jobs and then searched valiantly to find a new job and could not find a new job, and so they pay their rent, they buy food, they provide for their children, they buy school clothes with unemployment insurance.

We are told: We cannot reach an agreement, so we will just let it expire. We will not extend it. It will be OK.

It will be OK for everybody here who gets up and showers in the morning and puts on a nice blue suit and comes to work. There is nobody here who is unemployed, but there are a whole lot of people in this country who are unemployed.

If ever there were a need to extend unemployment insurance, it is now. We cannot do that to the most vulnerable people in this country.

It is very interesting. It was not too many months ago that there was a proposal on the floor of the Senate: Let's give \$700 billion to the biggest financial firms in America to bail them out. They ran this country into the ditch with unbelievable greed and speculation and recklessness. Then after running this country into the economic ditch, there is a bill brought to the Congress that says: We need to bail them out, \$700 billion—a three-page bill. They said: We need to have it passed in 3 days—\$700 billion. I did not vote for it, but there are plenty of people who did who now say it is too much